arXiv:1511.03371v2 [cs.SI] 24 Nov 2015

What do Vegans do in their Spare Time? Latent Interest Detection in Multi-Community Networks

Jack Hessel, Alexandra Schofield, Lillian Lee, David Mimno
Cornell University
{jhessel, xanda, llee}@cs.cornell.edu, mimno@cornell.edu

Abstract

Most social network analysis works at the level of interactions between users. But the vast growth in size and complexity of social networks enables us to examine interactions at larger scale. In this work we use a dataset of 76M submissions to the social network Reddit, which is organized into distinct sub-communities called subreddits. We measure the similarity between entire subreddits both in terms of user similarity and topical similarity. Our goal is to find community pairs with similar userbases, but dissimilar content; we refer to this type of relationship as a "latent interest." Detection of latent interests not only provides a perspective on individual users as they shift between roles (student, sports fan, political activist) but also gives insight into the dynamics of Reddit as a whole. Latent interest detection also has potential applications for recommendation systems and for researchers examining community evolution.

1 Introduction and Related Work

In many social networks consisting of people and the relationships between those people, there is additional *group* or *community* structure. This structure may be implicit and need to be inferred [1, 2], or explicit, such as in social-media sites offering user-created interest groups. We focus on detecting *anomalous* relationships between entire explicit communities. In particular, we define relationships between communities in two different ways, and use these competing definitions to explore a phenomenon we refer to as "latent interest." First, we consider a simple measure based on user overlap: two communities are similar if they have many participants in common; This measure has appeared in other work, such as [3, 4]. Second, we define a measure based on the language of each community. By explicitly comparing the differences between the user-based and language-based metrics, we can discover relationships that might not be captured by using only a single similarity metric. For example, we can ask "what do vegans do when they aren't talking about veganism?"

Why might someone care about latent interests? Identifying a community with a latent interest in another could assist in suggesting interesting new communities for a user to join. Previous recommendation systems are based on learned user similarities [5, 6] or learned item similarities [7, 8], but they are generally based on only one measure of similarity (e.g., both users watched a movie, both users purchased an item). In our case, while such suggestions could be made solely based on either the user similarities *or* the content similarities, identifying latent interests can produce recommendations that incorporate *both* while allowing flexibility in the trade-off between novelty and similarity. Furthermore, detecting subtle relationships between sub-communities might be useful for learning about the context surrounding the evolution of single communities [9], or the adoption and abandonment of a community by groups of users [10]; or it could be used to determine whether two

sub-communities could be merged [3] or to help infer whether there are unobserved ties between individuals in the two distinct sub-communities.

While we are aware of no work that *contrasts* multiple definitions of similarity to detect new types of relationships, previous work has explored the interplay of topic and social structure. For instance, in [11], the authors examine the capacity of Twitter hashtags to predict underlying social structures. In a similar vein, [12] explore the extent to which Twitter acts as a news source and, separately, as a social network. Also, [13] explore clustering through content and social structures using social tags on Instagram.

There also exist several topic models for uncovering latent network structure that take content and social structure into account. For instance, Topic-link LDA [14], Pairwise Link-LDA [15], and Relational Topic Models [16] jointly model social structures and user content. Reddit has been specifically examined recently using backbone networks [4] but without looking deeply at textual content.

We find that our methods for defining user and content similarity are meaningful in a prediction setting, and then derive a heuristic method for combining our measures to detect latent interests.

2 Dataset Description

We use a dataset of posts from `reddit.com` compiled by Tan and Lee [17] from an original data dump by Jason Baumgartner. This dataset consists of roughly 76M submissions made to the social networking website from January 2008 to February 2014. Notably, this dataset does not include the user comments in response to these submissions. Items by bots and spammers have been filtered out. Reddit is organized into a large number of interest-specific subcommunities called subreddits. A user may post to individual subreddits and participate in the community upvoting, downvoting, and commenting on content other users have submitted. An example of a popular subreddit is `/r/aww`, where users submit pictures of cute animals.

For our analysis, we focus on subreddits that have enough text data to understand the language used by members of the community. Hence, from the set of all subreddits, we select subreddits for which there are at least 500 text posts available, and at least 300 unique users have submitted either text or links. This filter results in our final set of 3.2K considered communities.

Next, we extract all 22.8M text posts made to our subreddit set. Some communities are much larger than others: the subreddit `/r/leagueoflegends` contains more text posts than the smallest 800 communities we consider combined. To prevent our language model from being overwhelmed by these large communities, we impose an upper bound on the total number of text posts we model for a single subreddit. Specifically, if a subreddit is associated with more than 5000 text posts, we select a random subset of 5000 of its posts to consider. As a final filter, a text post is only considered if it has a length greater than 20 words. After this filtration process, we are left with just under 6.6M text posts.

We are interested in determining a group of users who have participated in each community. For each user who has posted something to any of our 3.2K subreddits, we extract the sequence of subreddits they post to, as in [17]. For the purposes of this work we discard posting order and frequency.

To encourage other researchers to consider networks of communities, bigger and better corpora for topic modeling, and the interplay between content and users, we publicly release[1] the data. Specifically, we release a version of the balanced, 6.6M document corpus from [17], our hand-curated set of overlapping subreddit communities, and the pairwise topic/user similarities we used to define our networks.

[1] `http://www.cs.cornell.edu/~jhessel/projectPages/latentInterest.htm`

$\alpha_k \cdot 10^2$	Description	Top Words
.992	Purchase	store buy online stores shop find local sell good price
.433	Donations	donate money charity raise donations people support donation
.332	Tabletop RPG	character magic party level campaign spell spells dragon
.147	Bioshock	time timeline booker elizabeth peter universe infinite end back
.133	Pokemon	shiny male adamant timid female ball modest egg jolly traded

Table 1: A random sample of 5 topics from our LDA model learned from 6.6M posts to the site `reddit.com`, along with human-authored descriptions. Also included are the optimized document-topic priors for each topic; this can be thought of as a rough indication of how frequently the topic appeared throughout the documents.

3 From Data to Graphs

3.1 Content Similarity

We use topic models to define the content distances between all pairs of subreddits in our data. Topic models are unsupervised matrix factorization methods which assume hierarchical latent structure to data. Though these models can be applied to many types of discrete input, they were born out of a desire to understand topical themes within large textual corpora. When applied to text, the most popular topic model, Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) [18], assumes a set of latent "topics," represented by multinomial distributions over words. Documents are similarly represented as multinomal distributions over topics. In total, each word in each document is asssumed to be generated by first drawing a topic from the document-level topic distribution, and then drawing the specific word-type from a corpus-level topic-word distribution. By adding a Dirichlet prior to these multinomial distributions, LDA extends simpler models like probabilistic latent semantic indexing [19] to a fully generative model, allowing the algorithm to extend to previously unseen documents.

We are first interested in computing topic distributions for each document in our corpus. The inference process of LDA estimates a matrix θ where each row θ_d represents a mixture distribution over K latent topics for each document d. Given this matrix, for each subreddit S, we can find the average topic distribution of that subreddit as $\bar{\theta}_S = \frac{1}{|S|} \sum_{d \in S} \theta_d$. In this case, we apply a topic model in the traditional sense, treating individual text submissions as documents, and words as the discrete observations.

Given $\bar{\theta}_S$ for each subreddit S, we define the textual similarity of of communities A and B in terms of the Jensen-Shannon divergence. Specifically, our symmetric similarity function is given as

$$S_{text}(A, B) = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(KL(\bar{\theta}_A || M) + KL(\bar{\theta}_B || M) \right) , \tag{1}$$

where $M = \frac{1}{2}(\bar{\theta}_A + \bar{\theta}_B)$, and $KL(X||Y)$ is the Kullback-Leibler divergence of Y from X. Note that $0 \leq S_{text}(A, B) \leq 1$.

We used the Mallet toolkit [20] to perform inference. We used a uniform Dirichlet prior over the topic-word distributions of $\beta = .01$, and use the built-in functionality for hyperparameter optimization over the document-topic prior α [21]. We choose our number of topics K by sweeping the parameter value over a small set of values, namely, $\{100, 300, 500\}$. Evaluating the quality of topic models is a difficult task. For instance, it is known that topic models that fit to unseen data better likely produce *worse* topics, as judged by human evaluators [22]. Here, we perform no intrinsic evaluation of our models, deferring to our task-specific parameter search with ground truth data to determine which number of topics is best. A random sample of topics from the $K = 300$ model is given in Table 1.

3.2 User Similarity

While clustering could be used to define user similarity between different communities, we err on the side of simplicity and use a member-overlap-based comparison as our starting point. Specifically, we define the weight between communities A and B in terms of their user sets A_u and B_u as the

Jaccard similarity given by

$$S_{user}(A, B) = \frac{|A_u \cap B_u|}{|A_u \cup B_u|}. \tag{2}$$

4 Network Clustering with Ground Truth

Our first goal is to establish that these similarity metrics are able to define networks that express community structure among subreddits close to a ground-truth set of relationships we expect. We use an off-the-shelf algorithm to cluster based on both the text and user similarities described in the previous section, and compare against a set of hand-curated ground truth clusters. Once we establish that these two networks express meaningful relationships, we then discuss our method for latent interest detection.

We first gather a set of ground truth clusters of subreddits. Each subreddit is associated with meta-information compiled by moderators of that subreddit. Often included in this meta-information is a list of related communities,[2] and we extracted 51 such connected components from these lists, using several popular subreddits as starting points. After filtering these lists for communities that were among the 3.2K we considered, we were left with 37 ground truth clusters.

Standard, non-network clustering algorithms are not sufficient to address our setting because of the *overlapping* community phenomenon. Traditional community detection algorithms ([23, 24] offer good reviews) generally assume that each node is a member of a *single* community. However, there is growing interest in relaxing this assumption and allowing for cluster overlaps in the case of complex networks [25, 26, 27].

In our case, it is very easy to think of cases where one subreddit could reasonably belong to multiple clusters. For instance, consider the subreddit `/r/SanJoseSharks`, which is dedicated to a professional hockey franchise based in San Jose, California. Allowing an unsupervised algorithm the option to place this community into two clusters, one for hockey teams and one for all California sports teams, is reasonable. As such, we use a state-of-the-art overlapping community detector, Speaker-listener Label Propagation Algorithm (SLPA, also called GANXiS) [28], for our clustering.

SLPA outputs a set of overlapping clusters that we would like to compare with a ground truth set of overlapping clusters. However, typical clustering evaluation metrics do not work if the single-membership assumption is violated. For evaluation, we therefore use two overlapping-community evaluation metrics: an extension of *normalized mutual information (NMI)* that accounts for multi-cluster membership [23] and the *Omega index* Ω [29]. Their implementation is described and provided by [30].

4.1 Re-scaling Similarities

While a majority of pairwise user-based similarities are zero, the median text-based similarity between all pairs of subreddits computed from Equation 1 is still very large. If a graph were constructed using these unscaled, raw values, subreddit pairs with *below average* textual similarity would still be assigned a positive weight.

We compute the following rescaling of text similarities that is more appropriately considered as a weight in a (sparser) graph. First, we compute the mean μ of all $S_{text}(A, B)$. Then, if $S_{text}(A, B) < \mu$, meaning that A and B have below average textual similarity, the corresponding weight in the content network between A and B is set to zero. If $S_{text}(A, B) \geq \mu$, μ is subtracted from $S_{text}(A, B)$. Finally, the result is linearly scaled such that μ maps to 0, and the maximum possible value maps to 1. In total, this sparsity-inducing re-scaling can be summarized as:

$$S'_{text}(A, B) = \max\left(0, \frac{S_{text}(A, B) - \mu}{1 - \mu}\right). \tag{3}$$

Even after rescaling the text in accordance with Equation 3, it is not clear that S'_{text} and S_{user} are, in their unmodified form, optimal for deriving network weights. We introduce some scaling

[2] An interactive visualization of inter-community connections based on this related-subreddit information has been created by Andrei Kashcha, e.g., `http://www.yasiv.com/reddit#/Search?q=sanjosesharks`.

	Random Const Size	Random True Size	Users	Text
$100 \cdot \Omega$	.74±.08	.89±.10	15.90±.57	**51.36** ±2.40
$100 \cdot NMI$	0.0±0.01	0.0±0.01	18.51±.61	**28.90** ±1.50

Table 2: Clustering evaluation results for two baselines, the user network, and the textual content network. "Random Const Size" is a constant prediction of constant-sized, randomly selected clusters. The constant size is selected to be the average number of subreddits that appear in a ground truth cluster, but membership is randomized. "Random True Size" first samples a random permutation of the evaluation subreddits, and then partitions the permutation into sets of equal to the size to the ground truth sets. "Users" is community detection derived from pairwise Jaccard similarity scores between user sets. "Text" is a content-based clustering derived from textual similarity. All results are reported with 95% confidence intervals drawn over 100 random test splits. The maximum value for both evaluation metrics is 100, higher is better.

parameters which we optimize using a validation set. Specifically, we partition our 37 ground truth subreddit clusters into a validation set of 17 and a test set of 20. We perform a grid search over a percentile-cutoff parameter p (i.e. edges are disregarded if they are under a specific percentile), an exponential scaling factor a, a community overlapping propensity measure r, and, in the case of the content graph, over the number of topics K included in the topic model. Edge weights that exceed the percentile cutoff are then set according to the scaling factor as

$$w(A, B) = exp(a \cdot S(A, B)) - 1\,, \tag{4}$$

where S is S'_{text} or S_{user}, depending on the context. r is a parameter internal to SLPA. Because our validation/testing sets are small, we run our experiments over 100 val/test splits.

4.2 Experimental Results

Table 2 compares methods of deriving network weights against two baselines. "Random Const Size" simply predicts a random set of constant size clusters. "Random True Size" is allowed to observe the size of the ground-truth sets, and generates a random permutation preserving those sizes. The results reported are 95% confidence intervals computed over the 100 cross-validation splits.

Our text-based similarities perform better than the random baselines and the user network. This result demonstrates that a topic model can successfully be used to define a textual similarity function between two complex communities, though simpler language comparison methods might suffice. The user similarity network underperforms relative to the content network, but this result is not entirely surprising. The underlying ground truth was based on annotations provided by moderators from particular communities reporting other communities with similar *content*. It is precisely these differences we wish to extract with latent interest detection.

5 Latent Interest Detection

To detect the latent interests of a given subreddit, we identify communities with high user similarity, but low textual similarity. For this task, we return to our consideration of text/user similarity given in Equations 1 and 2, respectively. The task of combining these measures is complicated by the fact that their corresponding distributions have very different shapes.

Here, we only aim to pose the problem of how to detect latent interests and to offer preliminary, baseline results; we leave a comparison of methods for latent interest detection to future work. As a simple starting point, we first compute the top 100 most similar subreddits in terms of userbases. From this set, we discard any subreddit that is among the top 500 most similar in terms of textual similarity. We are left with a set of subreddits with highly similar users, but relatively distinct language. Of these, we compute a ranking with a simple heuristic that rewards differences between user and text similarities. Specifically, we define the latent interest of communities A and B as

$$LI(A, B) = S_{user}(A, B) \cdot (1 - S_{text}(A, B)) \tag{5}$$

where $S_{text}(A, B)$ is given in Equation 1 and $S_{user}(A, B)$ is Jaccard similarity as in Equation 2. The simplicity of this formula is meant to convey optimization of a mathematical conjunction.

Community	Top Topics	Top Latent Interests
vegan	diet food cooking animal moral	AnimalRights Anarchism yoga VegRecipes Feminism environment **philosophy gardening bicycling** Buddhism
Liberal	elections government1 government2 arguments gunlaws	**California** $\mathrm{GunsAreCool}^*$ **Bad_Cop_No_Donut** economy **Feminism immigration RenewableEnergy energy newyork** democrats [**"GunsAreCool" is a satirical name; this subreddit advocates stricter gun conrol*]
Conservative	elections government2 government1 arguments legislation	**Bad_Cop_No_Donut guns Christianity Military economy** Economics **Catholicism** progun **climateskeptics religion**
SanJoseSharks	game hockey tickets win season	SFGiants SanJose 49ers **bayarea** OaklandAthletics **warriors EA_NHL hockeyplayers SJSU SFBayJobs**
CanadaPolitics	elections gunlaws discussion economy reddit	Quebec ontario metacanada toronto ottawa **Habs** montreal vancouver VictoriaBC **PersonalFinanceCanada**
LadiesofScience	gradschool jobs college research socialLife	labrats xxfitness femalefashionadvice **London_homes askgis** bioinformatics **FancyFollicles craftit chemhelp GirlGamers**
PAX	tickets event fishing vacationSuggestions junk1	PaxPassExchange SeaJobs LoLCodeTrade **bostonhousing** boardgames **gamesell** Seattle **LeagueOfGiving DnD gameswap**

Table 3: Latent interest examples. The second column gives manually-assigned names for the most frequent topics in a particular community. The third column gives the top 10 latent interests (subreddit names). The first row addresses the title's question, the next two rows are exploratory political examples, and the bottom 4 rows are cases where multi-community membership is more easily discovered. There are often significant differences between the topics discussed in a community and the focus of their latent interests. Bolded are latent interests not found in the top 10 most similar subreddits by only user similarity.

We maximize both similarity of user bases and dissimilarity of text content without permitting one of these objectives to overpower the other, unlike an additive formula of the form $S_{user}(A, B) - S_{text}(A, B)$.

It should be noted that for subreddits with multiple plausible memberships (i.e. `SanJoseSharks` could be considered in the frame of ice hockey, or California sports) it is not meaningful to declare one membership as the latent one apriori. To address this ambiguity, we report the top topics from $\bar{\theta}_S$ along with the detected latent interest. Ideally, it should be clear what the primary topics of conversation are based on the topics discussed in the text. We picked a set of 4 communities with clear multi-community memberships to examine as a baseline. The latent interests derived in these cases should be clear, yet should still contrast with the main topical focus of the subreddit. These baselines are presented in the last four rows of Table 3. Because the goal of latent interest detection

is to discover unexpected and surprising relationships, quantitative evaluation is a difficult problem we leave to future work. It should be noted that we tuned our ranking method by examining the model's output on the `/r/Conservative` community, and `/r/vegan` was chosen post-hoc; however, we committed to our other specific example communities before seeing the the results, and computed latent interests exactly once.

Our method of contrasting textual and user similarity produces results that are different than simply using a single ranking metric. For instance, consider the top latent interests of `/r/Liberal`, shown in Table 3. Of those presented, 7/10 do not appear in the top 10 text/user similarity rankings. In the case of `/r/Conservative`, this fraction of novel discoveries is 8/10. By explicitly seeking subreddits with dissimilar content but similar users, we discover new types of relationships.

6 Conclusion

We define two different similarity functions over networks with nodes consisting of entire communities. We then use these definitions for a graph clustering task to demonstrate their informativeness for latent interest detection. We experimentally determine that anomalous community relationships have face validity, but defer a more rigorous quantitative evaluation to future work.

This work advances our ability to study social network behavior at both the macro and micro scales. As the size and complexity of social networks increases, understanding not just user-user interactions but community-community interactions becomes increasingly important in recognizing large-scale patterns. We can also use community-community interactions to study small-scale behaviors at the user level, as individuals select distinct forums to participate in distinct themes and social roles — even though the actual user community might be nearly identical.

Acknowledgments

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 0910664, a Google Research grant, the Cornell Institute for the Social Sciences, and a Cornell University fellowship. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the supporting institutions.

References

[1] Mark E. J. Newman. Modularity and community structure in networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 103(23):8577–8582, 2006.

[2] Santo Fortunato. Community detection in graphs. *Physics Reports*, 486(3):75–174, 2010.

[3] Heath Hohwald, Manuel Cebrían, Artura Canales, Rubén Lara, and Nuria Oliver. Inferring unobservable inter-community links in large social networks. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computational Science and Engineering, Symposium on Social Intelligence and Networking (SIN)*, volume 4, pages 375–380, Aug 2009.

[4] Randal S. Olson and Zachary P. Neal. Navigating the massive world of reddit: Using backbone networks to map user interests in social media. *PeerJ Computer Science*, 1:e4, 2015.

[5] Jitian Xiao, Yanchun Zhang, Xiaohua Jia, and Tianzhu Li. Measuring similarity of interests for clustering web-users. In *Proceedings of the 12th Australasian Database Conference*, pages 107–114. IEEE Computer Society, 2001.

[6] Cai-Nicolas Ziegler and Georg Lausen. Analyzing correlation between trust and user similarity in online communities. In *Trust Management*, pages 251–265. Springer, 2004.

[7] Badrul Sarwar, George Karypis, Joseph Konstan, and John Riedl. Item-based collaborative filtering recommendation algorithms. In *Proceedings of WWW*, pages 285–295. ACM, 2001.

[8] Greg Linden, Brent Smith, and Jeremy York. Amazon.com recommendations: Item-to-item collaborative filtering. *IEEE Internet Computing*, 7(1):76–80, 2003.

[9] Gergely Palla, Albert-László Barabási, and Tamás Vicsek. Quantifying social group evolution. *Nature*, 446(7136):664–667, 2007.

[10] Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, Robert West, Dan Jurafsky, Jure Leskovec, and Christopher Potts. No country for old members: User lifecycle and linguistic change in online communities. In *Proceedings of WWW*, pages 307–318, 2013.

[11] Daniel M. Romero, Chenhao Tan, and Johan Ugander. On the interplay between social and topical structure. In *Proceedings of ICWSM*, 2013.

[12] Haewoon Kwak, Changhyun Lee, Hosung Park, and Sue Moon. What is Twitter, a social network or a news media? In *Proceedings of WWW*, pages 591–600, 2010.

[13] Emilio Ferrara, Roberto Interdonato, and Andrea Tagarelli. Online popularity and topical interests through the lens of instagram. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM Conference on Hypertext and Social Media*, pages 24–34, New York, NY, USA, 2014. ACM.

[14] Yan Liu, Alexandru Niculescu-Mizil, and Wojciech Gryc. Topic-link LDA: Joint models of topic and author community. In *Proceedings of ICML*, pages 665–672, 2009.

[15] Ramesh M. Nallapati, Amr Ahmed, Eric P. Xing, and William W. Cohen. Joint latent topic models for text and citations. In *Proceedings of KDD*, pages 542–550, New York, NY, USA, 2008. ACM.

[16] Jonathan Chang and David Blei. Relational topic models for document networks. In *Proceedings of AIStats*, 2009.

[17] Chenhao Tan and Lillian Lee. All who wander: On the prevalence and characteristics of multi-community engagement. In *Proceedings of WWW*, 2015.

[18] David M. Blei, Andrew Y. Ng, and Michael I. Jordan. Latent Dirichlet allocation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3:993–1022, 2003.

[19] Thomas Hofmann. Probabilistic latent semantic indexing. In *Proceedings of SIGIR*, pages 50–57. ACM, 1999.

[20] Andrew Kachites McCallum. Mallet: A machine learning for language toolkit. http://mallet.cs.umass.edu, 2002.

[21] Hanna M. Wallach, David M. Mimno, and Andrew McCallum. Rethinking LDA: Why priors matter. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1973–1981, 2009.

[22] Jonathan Chang, Sean Gerrish, Chong Wang, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and David M. Blei. Reading tea leaves: How humans interpret topic models. In *Proceedings of NIPS*, pages 288–296, 2009.

[23] Andrea Lancichinetti and Santo Fortunato. Community detection algorithms: aacomparative analysis. *Physical Review E*, 80(5):056117, 2009.

[24] Jure Leskovec, Kevin J. Lang, and Michael Mahoney. Empirical comparison of algorithms for network community detection. In *Proceedings of WWW*, pages 631–640. ACM, 2010.

[25] Stephen Kelley. *The existence and discovery of overlapping communities in large-scale networks*. PhD thesis, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, 2009.

[26] Jierui Xie, Stephen Kelley, and Boleslaw K. Szymanski. Overlapping community detection in networks: The state-of-the-art and comparative study. *ACM Computing Surveys (csur)*, 45(4):43:1–43:35, 2013.

[27] Fergal Reid, Aaron McDaid, and Neil Hurley. Partitioning breaks communities. In *Mining Social Networks and Security Informatics*, pages 79–105. Springer, 2013.

[28] Jierui Xie and Boleslaw K. Szymanski. Towards linear time overlapping community detection in social networks. In *The 16th Pacific-Asia Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (PAKDD)*, pages 25–36. Springer, 2012.

[29] Linda M. Collins and Clyde W Dent. Omega: A general formulation of the rand index of cluster recovery suitable for non-disjoint solutions. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 23(2):231–242, 1988.

[30] Aaron F. McDaid, Derek Greene, and Neil Hurley. Normalized mutual information to evaluate overlapping community finding algorithms. http://arxiv.org/abs/1110.2515, October 2011.